



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,375	11/25/2003	Sunao Kawai	116533	4288
25944 7590 09/25/2009 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
HOANG, HIEU T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2452				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/25/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/720,375

Applicant(s)

KAWAI, SUNAO

Examiner

HIEU T. HOANG

Art Unit

2452

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-57 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CDC)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5/5/09

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on //2009.
2. Claims 56-57 are new.
3. Claim 2 is cancelled.
4. Claims 1 and 3-57 are pending.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments on claim 1 have been fully considered but are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection.

Information Disclosure Statement

6. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 05/05/2009 has been considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 20-25, 27-32, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 45-47, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filion et al. (US 6,119,156, hereafter

Filion), in view of Bares (US 5,194,895) and further in view of Simpson et al. (US 2003/0084086, hereafter Simpson).

9. For claim 1, Filion discloses a network system comprising:

a plurality of terminal devices and a printer whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said printer being communicatively connected through a network (fig. 1, col. 3 l. 9-24, managers or terminal devices, abstract, network management SNMP system), said printer executing print jobs in accordance with operational parameters set to said printer (col. 6 lines 4-49, printer print job settings or configurations applied to print jobs) operational parameters of said printer being set by users of said plurality of terminal devices through the network (col. 6 lines 4-21, printer settings set by users through a network);

a monitoring period determining system that determines a particular time with respect to operational parameters set by a first user (col. 3 l. 65- col. 6 l. 9, operational parameters are locked by user A at a particular time);

a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received (col. 4 lines 24-67, checking at a particular time that another request currently intersects with a current locked parameter)

a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that the request for the modification is received (col. 4 lines 60-62, requests that does not intersect others at a particular time are allowed),

said modification control system executing at least one of rejecting the request by the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second user if said monitoring system determines that the request for modification is received at the particular time (col. 4 lines 64-67, send a fail message if request intersects with locked parameters at a same time);

wherein the printer executes a print job in accordance with the operational parameters that are set by the first user (col. 6 l. 22-49, settings of a printer by a user),

Filion does not explicitly disclose:

a monitoring period; the use of the monitoring period for modifying the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that the request for the modification is received after expiration of the monitoring period; the monitoring period is defined as a time period after the operational parameters are set by the first user; wherein the modification control system modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification made by the first user or the second user if the monitoring period has expired; wherein the modification control system modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the request for modification is made by the first user during the monitoring period.

However, in the same field of printer configuration, Bares discloses:

a monitoring period (col. 5, l. 4-11 and l. 27-56, col. 4 l. 19-37, a CPU monitoring user settings of a printer with respect to time, date);

modifying the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring period is received after expiration of the monitoring period (col. 4 l. 64-66, col. 5 l. 17-20, return to normal settings and/or allowing changes to settings)

the monitoring period is defined as a time period after the operational parameters are set by the first user (col. 5, l. 4-11, l. 27-57, a monitored period after the user presets the printer settings);

wherein the modification control system modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification made by the first user or the second user if the monitoring period has expired (col. 4 l. 47-58, a user can change settings);

wherein the modification control system modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the request for modification is made by the first user during the monitoring period (col. 4 l. 47-53, col. 5 l. 17-20, col. 7 l. 34-38, user changing settings when printer operating with preset timed settings. Alternatively, this limitation is simply read as a user cancelling the print jobs and therefore cancelling the settings, as known in the art).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bares's monitoring of time when certain settings are applied to a printer to the system of Filion to lock settings for a certain period of time to provide more user control or restriction of the printer's usage.

Filion-Bares does not explicitly disclose:

executing at least one of rejecting the request by the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second user if said monitoring system determines that the request for modification is received during the monitoring period.

However, Simpson discloses:

executing at least one of rejecting the request by the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second user if said monitoring system determines that the request for modification is received during a predetermined monitored period ([0076], store second print job and apply second print settings if time does not conflict, prompt the second user to select a different print time if his print time conflicts with the reserved print time with settings of the first user)

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Filion, Bares and Simpson so that Simpson's method of locking and rejecting conflicting requests can be applied to time period when operational parameters are set by a user so that settings are only locked within a period of time to allow automatic release of setting locks after the period expires.

10. For claim 3, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses said monitoring period determining system includes a time period inputting system, the monitoring period being determined based on the time period input through said time period inputting system (Bares, col. 5 l. 17-20, Simpson, [0074], [0075], reserved print job has an input start time).

11. For claim 4, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses an end of the monitoring period is defined as a point of time (Bares, col. 5 l. 27-57, Simpson, [0075], processing time).

12. For claim 5, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses said monitoring period determining system includes a time inputting system, an end of the monitoring period being determined based

on the point of time which is input through said time inputting system (Bares, fig. 2, items 12, 32, col. 5 l. 27-57, Simpson, [0074], [0075], reserved end time is based on start time and processing time).

13. For claim 6, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification control system is a message, which is transmitted to the second user, indicating that a current time is within the monitoring period (Simpson, [0076], a message to the second user to select a new start time if time conflicts).

14. For claim 7, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification control system is a message, which is transmitted to the first user, informing that the operational parameters have been modified by the second user within the monitoring period (Simpson, [0070], "job deferred" message).

15. For claim 8, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses a permission requesting system that requests the first user for permission to modify the operational parameters (Simpson, [0070], interrupt request).

16. For claim 10, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses a postponed period checking system that checks whether a postponed period for postponing the modification of the operational parameters has expired, the postponed period being instructed by the terminal device, said modification controlling system enabling the modification of the operational parameters

after expiration of the postponed period (Simpson, [0076], postponed second print job with settings).

17. For claim 11, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses a setting management device which is connected with said terminal device and a plurality of printers through the network, said setting management device being provided with a setting input system that is used to input modification settings of the operational parameters for said plurality of printers, the modification settings input through said setting input system being set in said plurality of printers (Simpson, fig. 5A, 2B, [0061], client machine includes settings input module, which is a web interface).

18. For claim 12, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses one of said plurality of terminal devices includes said setting management device (Simpson, fig. 5A, client machine includes settings module).

19. For claim 13, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses said setting management device includes a printer selecting system that selects at least one of the plurality of printers as a target device whose operational parameters are to be modified, the modification settings input through said setting input system being effected as the modification settings of said at least one of the printers selected by said printer selecting system (Simpson, [0113], select a printer for printing with personal settings).

20. For claim 14, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses said terminal device includes an instruction system that transmits instructions to the printer using a predetermined communication protocol (Simpson, [0041], e.g., HTTP); and wherein said printer includes a job executing system that executes a job which is instructed by said instruction system and transmitted from said terminal device using the predetermined communication protocol (Simpson, [0041], [0054], send jobs to printer using a protocol), the operational parameters including a parameter to be used when said printer communicates with said terminal device using the predetermined communication protocol (Simpson, abstract, job with selected options).

21. For claim 15, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses the operational parameters including a parameter related to an output format when said printer prints a print job (Simpson, [0066], finishing options of print jobs).

22. For claim 20, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses said printer includes an interruption procedure execution system that executes an interruption procedure when a predetermined job is executed, the operational parameters including a parameter that enables/disables execution of the interruption procedure during the predetermined job (Simpson, [0070], interrupt an executed print job).

23. Claims 39 and 42 are rejected for the same rationale in claim 1.

24. For claim 56, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses the monitoring period is a predetermined period after the operational parameters have been set by the first user (Bares, col. 3 l. 44-49, certain time of day).

25. For claim 57, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses the monitoring period is set by the first user (Bares, col. 4 l. 47-49, col. 5 l. 27-57).

26. For claim 45, the claim is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 1, wherein the monitoring condition is met when the request for modification is outside a period of setting of operational parameters by the first user (Filion, col. 3 l. 65- col. 6 l. 9, operational parameters are locked by user A at a particular time, Bares, col. 5 l. 27-56, col. 4 l. 19-37, a CPU monitoring user settings of a printer with respect to time, date or monitoring period, Simpson, [0076], store second print job and apply second print settings if time does not conflict, prompt the second user to select a different print time if his print time conflicts with the reserved print time with settings of the first user)

27. For claim 21, Filion discloses a network system comprising a plurality of terminal devices and a printer whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said printer being communicatively connected through a network (fig. 1, col. 3 l. 9-24, managers or terminal devices, abstract, network management SNMP system), said printer executing print jobs in accordance with operational parameters set to said printer (col. 6 lines 4-49, printer settings or configurations applied to print jobs); the operational parameters of

said printer being set by users of said plurality of terminal devices through the network (col. 6 lines 4-21, printer settings set by users through a network);

operational parameters of said printer set by a first user independently from the first user issuing a processing request (col. 3 lines 9-24, setting objects is not processing print jobs);

a monitoring period determining system that determines a particular time with respect to operational parameters set by a first user (col. 3 l. 65- col. 6 l. 9, operational parameters are locked by user A at a particular time);

a monitoring system that monitors whether a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received (col. 4 lines 24-67, checking at a particular time that another request currently intersects with a current locked parameter)

a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that the request for the modification is received at a different time than the particular time (col. 4 lines 60-62, requests that does not intersect others at a particular time are allowed),

said modification control system executing at least one of rejecting the request by the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second user if said monitoring system determines that the request for modification is received at the particular time (col. 4 lines 64-67, send a fail message if request intersects with locked parameters at the particular time).

Filion does not disclose:

a number of execution determining system that determines the number of times of operations to be executed by said printer in accordance with operational parameters, including

the number of times of operations to be executed by said printer, set by a first user; a monitoring system that monitors whether time required for the number of executed operations of said printer exceeds time required for the number of times of operations determined by said number of execution determining system when a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received; and a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that the time at executed operations of said printer exceeds the processing time of the number of times determined by said number of execution determining system, said modification control system executing at least one of rejecting the request by the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second user if said monitoring system determines that the time at the number of executed operations of said printer is equal to or less than the processing time of the number of times determined by said number of execution determining system.

However, in the same field of printer configuration, Bares discloses as in claim 1:

a monitoring period (col. 5, l. 4-11 and l. 27-56, col. 4 l. 19-37, a CPU monitoring user settings of a printer with respect to time, date); modifying the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring period is received after expiration of the monitoring period (col. 4 l. 64-66, col. 5 l. 17-20, return to normal settings and/or allowing changes to settings); the monitoring period is defined as a time period after the operational parameters are set by the first user (col. 5, l. 4-11, l. 27-57, a monitored period after the user presets the printer settings); wherein the modification control system modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification made by the first user or the second

user if the monitoring period has expired (col. 4 l. 47-58, a user can change settings); wherein the modification control system modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the request for modification is made by the first user during the monitoring period (col. 4 l. 47-53, col. 5 l. 17-20, col. 7 l. 34-38, user changing settings when printer operating with preset timed settings).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Bares's monitoring of time when certain settings are applied to a printer to the system of Filion to lock settings for a certain period of time to provide more user control or restriction of the printer's usage.

Simpson further discloses:

a number of execution determining system that determines the number of times of operations to be executed by said printer in accordance with operational parameters, set by a first user ([0075], determine number of pages or copies to be printed with associated settings by a first user);

a monitoring system that monitors whether time required for the number of executed operations of said printer exceeds time required for the number of times (of operations) determined by said number of execution determining system when a request for modification of the operational parameters issued by a second user is received ([0076], [0077], [0070], determining conflicts when a second user reserve a second print job when pages or copies of a first user's print job are being processed); and

a modification control system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with the request for modification if the monitoring system determines that the time at executed

operations of said printer exceeds the processing time of the number of times determined by said number of execution determining system ([0076], store job and apply second print settings if time does not conflict),

said modification control system executing at least one of rejecting the request by the second user and outputting a message corresponding to the request by the second user if said monitoring system determines that the time at the number of executed operations of said printer is equal to or less than the processing time of the number of times determined by said number of execution determining system ([0076], prompt the second user to select a different print time if his print time conflicts with the reserved print time with settings of the first user).

It would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Filion, Bares and Simpson so that a monitoring period of Simpson can be applied to time when operational parameters or settings are locked by a user so that settings are only locked within a period of time to allow automatic release of printer locks after the period is expired.

Filion-Bares-Simpson discloses monitoring is based on time period set by a user that is determined based on number of operations (such as number of pages or copies) (Bares, col. 5, 1.4-11, 1. 27-57, Simpson, [0075], [0070])

Filion-Bares-Simpson does not explicitly disclose that monitoring is based on number of executed operations set by a user.

However, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Filion, Bares and Simpson so that determining a “blackout” stage of modification requests from subsequent users can be done based on number of executed operations of the device instead of time monitoring so that subsequent users can only

request print jobs outside the “blacked out” stage set by the first user to simplify or provide an alternative to Simpson’s monitoring, and to have separate printer settings from printer processing so that users can provide settings in advance of processing, for example.

28. For claim 22, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses said terminal device includes an instruction system that instructs said printer to execute a job; wherein said printer includes a job executing system that executes the job instructed by said terminal device, said number of execution determining system determining the number of executions of the job to be executed by said job executing system (Simpson, [0075], fig. 2a, production device, a printer for executing print pages for a first user).

29. For claim 23, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification control system is a message, which is transmitted to the second user, indicating that the number of executed operations of said printer is equal to or less than the number of times determined by said number of execution determining system (Simpson, [0076], second user is prompted to select another start time because first user’s print job is in execution).

30. For claim 24, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses the message output by the modification control system is a message, which is transmitted to the first user, informing that the operational parameters have been modified by the second user before the number of executed operations of said printer exceeds the number of times determined by said number of execution

determining system (Simpson, [0070], interrupt request and job deferred messages to the first user).

31. Claims 25 and 27-32 are rejected for the same rationale as in claims 8 and 10-15 respectively.

32. Claim 37 is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 20.

33. Claims 40 and 43 are rejected for the same rationale in claim 21.

34. For claim 46, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses the operational parameters comprise functional parameters and protection parameters, the protection parameters being parameters entered by a first user, independent from a processing request, to control the modification of the functional parameters; and the monitoring period determining system determines the monitoring period with respect to the protection parameters set by the first user (Simpson, [0068], protection parameters are user settings regarding when certain printer parameters or functional parameters can be set, e.g. all boss's print jobs can be set so that they are uninterruptible independently of the print job request (by only checking the name of the boss) and when functional parameters can be set, for example, from 2 to 4 PM, Andy's jobs with certain settings are uninterruptible); operational parameters of said printer set by a first user independently from the first user issuing a processing request (col. 3 lines 9-24, setting objects is not processing print jobs)

35. For claim 47, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses the operational parameters comprise functional parameters and protection parameters, the protection parameters being parameters entered by a first user, independent from a processing request, to control the

modification of the functional parameters (Simpson, [0068], protection parameters are user settings regarding when certain printer parameters or functional parameters can be set, e.g. all boss's print jobs can be set so that they are uninterruptable independently of the print job request (by only checking the name of the boss) and when functional parameters can be set, for example, from 2 to 4 PM, Andy's jobs with certain settings are uninterruptable); and

the number of execution determining system determines the number of times of operations to be executed by said printer in accordance with the protection parameters set by the first user (Simpson, [0076], [0077], [0070], determining when pages or copies of a first user's print job are being processed and being interruptable or non-interruptable).

36. Claims 49, 52 and 55 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 46.

37. Claims 50 and 53 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 47.

38. Claims 16-19, 33-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filion-Bares-Simpson, in view of Official Notice.

39. For claims 16-19, Official Notice is taken that user's settings relating to output format of a print job such as banner print, sheet supply, default sheet and default tray are well-known in the art (see e.g., Costello, US 5,547,178)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Filion, Bares, Simpson and what has been known in the art

to apply user's settings relating to output format to Simpson's print jobs to provide customized printing options for the users.

40. For claims 33-36, Official Notice is taken that user's settings relating to output format of a print job such as banner print, sheet supply, default sheet and default tray are well-known in the art (see e.g., Costello, US 5,547,178)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Fillion-Bares-Simpson and what has been known in the art to apply user's settings relating to output format to Simpson's print jobs to provide customized printing options for the users.

41. Claims 9 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fillion-Bares-Simpson, in view of Nakamura et al. (US 2002/0161740, hereafter Nakamura).

42. For claim 9, Fillion-Bares-Simpson further discloses an effective period determining system that determines whether an effective period designated by the terminal device has expired. Simpson does not explicitly disclose a recovering system that sets the operational parameters to previously set values after expiration of the effective period.

However, Nakamura discloses the same ([0099]-[0101], restore the default settings after a period of customized user's setting has expired)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Filion, Bares, Simpson and Nakamura to reduce the potential effects (conflicts) on other users.

43. For claim 26, Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses an effective period determining system that determines whether an effective period designated by the terminal device has expired. Simpson does not explicitly disclose a recovering system that sets the operational parameters to previously set values after expiration of the effective period.

However, Nakamura discloses the same ([0099]-[0101], restore the default settings after a period of customized user's setting has expired)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Filion-Bares-Simpson and Nakamura to reduce the potential effects (conflicts) on other users.

44. Claims 38, 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filion, Bares, Simpson, in view of Armstrong et al. (US 2004/0039779, hereafter Armstrong).

45. For claim 38, Filion-Bares-Simpson discloses the invention as in claim 1. Filion-Bares-Simpson further discloses:

a message storing system that stores a message with which the operational parameters are modified in relationship with modified operational parameters (Simpson, fig. 2A, storage

devices, [0076], [0074], e.g., messages indicating “interrupt request” or “job deferred” associated with print jobs with different settings); and

a message outputting system that outputs the message stored in relationship with the modified operational parameters by said message storing system in response to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified operational parameters (Simpson, [0070], output, e.g., “job deferred” message when print job is changed or modified and second settings are applied).

Filion-Bares-Simpson does not explicitly disclose that the message is input by a user of the terminal device.

However, Armstrong discloses using customized messages that can be input by a user instead of default messages ([0110]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Filion, Bares, Simpson and Armstrong to customize status messages to provide the message receiver more details about the status messages (Armstrong, [0110]).

46. For claim 48, Filion-Bares-Simpson-Armstrong further discloses the operational parameters comprise functional parameters and protection parameters, the protection parameters being parameters entered by the first user, independent from a processing request, to control the modification of the functional parameters (Simpson, [0068], protection parameters are user settings regarding when certain printer parameters or functional parameters can be set, e.g. all boss's print jobs can be set so that they are uninterruptable independently of the print job request

(by only checking the name of the boss) and when functional parameters can be set, for example, from 2 to 4 PM, Andy's jobs with certain settings are uninterruptable);

the message storing system stores a message input by the first user of the terminal device with which the functional parameters and protection parameters are modified in relationship with modified functional parameters and protection parameters; and the message outputting system outputs the message stored in relationship with the modified functional parameters and protection parameters by said message storing system in response to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified functional parameters and protection parameters (Simpson, fig. 2A, storage devices, [0076], [0074], e.g., messages indicating "interrupt request" or "job deferred" associated with print jobs with different settings; [0070], output, e.g., "job deferred" message when print job is changed or modified and second settings are applied, Armstrong, [0110]).

operational parameters are requested independently from issuing a processing request by a user (Filion, col. 3 lines 9-24, printers settings requests different from print requests)

47. Claims 41, 44, 51, 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filion, Simpson, in view of Armstrong.

48. For claim 41, Filion discloses an electronic device for a network system having a plurality of terminal devices and a printer whose function is shared by said plurality of terminal devices, said plurality of terminal devices and said printer being communicatively connected through a network (fig. 1, col. 3 l. 9-24, managers or terminal devices, abstract, network

management SNMP system), operational parameters of said printer being set by said plurality of terminal devices through the network (col. 6 lines 4-21, printer settings set by users through a network), said network system comprising:

a modifying system that modifies the operational parameters in accordance with a request for modification of the operational parameters requested by a terminal device independent from a processing request (col. 1 l. 9-21, col. 4 l. 24-col. 5 l. 3, requests for setting printer parameters from agent devices separate from print requests);

Filion does not disclose a message storing system that stores a message with which the operational parameters are modified in relationship with modified operational parameters; and a message outputting system that outputs the message stored in relationship with the modified operational parameters by said message storing system in response to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified operational parameters.

However, Simpson discloses:

a message storing system that stores a message with which the operational parameters are modified in relationship with modified operational parameters (fig. 2A, storage devices, [0076], [0074], e.g., messages indicating “interrupt request” or “job deferred” associated with print jobs with different settings); and

a message outputting system that outputs the message stored in relationship with the modified operational parameters by said message storing system in response to an output command of a message corresponding to the modified operational parameters ([0070], output, e.g., “job deferred” message when print job is changed or modified and second settings are applied).

Filion-Simpson does not explicitly disclose that the message is input by a user of the terminal device.

However, Armstrong discloses using customized messages that can be input by a user instead of default messages ([0110]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Filion, Simpson, Armstrong to customize status messages to provide the message receiver more details about the status messages (Armstrong, [0110]) and to have separate printer settings from printer processing so that users can provide settings in advance of processing for example.

49. Claim 44 is rejected for the same rationale as in claim 41.

50. Claims 51 and 54 are rejected for the same rationale as in claim 48.

Conclusion

51. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

52. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HH

/Kenny S Lin/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452